DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 311 512 CS 506 842

AUTHOR Chang, Tsan-Kuo; And Others
TITLE Determining Nonresponse in Survey of Newspaper Editors.
PUB DATE Aug 89
NOTE 27p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (72nd, Washington, DC, August 10-13, 1989). Study supported in part by an RCA grant from the College of Graduate Studies, Cleveland State University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; Data Collection; Discriminant Analysis; *Editors; Higher Education; *Mail Surveys; National Surveys; *Newspapers; Occupational Surveys; *Research Methodology; Statistical Bias
IDENTIFIERS Journalism Research; *Nonresponse Bias; *Response Rates (Questionnaires)

ABSTRACT

In survey research, nonresponse has been one of the major concerns about survey accuracy and validity. A case in point is the increasing use of surveys in mass communications research; much previous research has dealt with nonresponse among the general public, but little is known about nonresponse in special subgroups in the population where any bias caused by nonresponse may have significant effects on the conclusions derived from the data. As part of a larger project, a study used a multivariate approach to determine nonresponse bias, if any, in a national survey of newspaper editors. A six-page closed-ended questionnaire was sent to 540 newspaper editors around the United States and received a 52% response rate after three mailings. Discriminant analysis examined the differences between respondents and non-respondents with respect to several intra- and extra-media variables simultaneously. Results showed that nonresponse does not necessarily cause a severe, significant bias in terms of some market and organizational characteristics of the newspapers selected in the sample. The major reason for nonresponse appeared to be related to newspaper editors' lack of time in the newsroom. These findings sugget that a well-designed and carefully executed mail survey is still the best and least expensive alternative for researching American journalist. (Four tables of data are included, and 29 references are attached.) (SR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED311512

Theory and Methodology Division

Determining Nonresponse in Survey of Newspaper Editors

Tsan-Kuo Chang
David Voelker
Jae-won Lee

Department of Communication
Cleveland State University
Cleveland, Ohio 44115
(216) 687-4641
Bitnet: R0687 at CSUOHIO

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Tsan-Kuo Chang
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Paper presented to the Theory and Methodology Division of the annual convention of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Washington, D.C., August 10-13, 1989.

Tsan-Kuo Chang is an assistant professor and Jae-won Lee is an associate professor in the Department of Communication at Cleveland State University where David Voelker is a graduate assistant. This study was supported in part by an RCA grant from the College of Graduate Studies, Cleveland State University.

CS506842

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Determining Nonresponse in Survey of Newspaper Editors

Abstract

This study uses a multivariate approach to determine nonresponse in a national survey of newspaper editors. The discriminant analysis examines the differences between respondents and nonrespondents with respect to several intra- and extra-media variables simultaneously. Results show that nonresponse does not necessarily cause a severe, significant bias in terms of some market and organizational characteristics of the 540 newspapers selected in the sample. The major reason for nonresponse appears to be related to newspaper editors' lack of time in the newsroom.

Determining Nonresponse in Survey of Newspaper Editors

In survey research, nonresponse has been one of the major concerns about survey accuracy among social science researchers, students of public opinion, and media practitioners (e.g., American Statistical Association, 1974; Cranberg, 1975). For whatever reasons, any sample with less than 100 % response rate indicates a failure in survey research to collect information from some of the members being sampled. Such failure may lead one to question the representativeness of a sample and the validity of information obtained through response. For one thing, some substantive issues of research interest may be very sensitive to distributional changes as a result of nonresponse (Hawkins, 1975), thus affecting the results of statistical analysis such as means, correlation, chi-square, and regression.

In the past, concerns over the potential problems inherent in survey nonresponse have led social science researchers to develop methods to reduce nonresponse rate (Blumberg, Fuller and Hare, 1974; Kochersberser, 1987; Traugott, Groves and Lepkowski, 1987), to measure nonresponse (Sosdian and Sharp, 1980), and to assess the effect of nonresponse bias on survey results, especially in mail surveys (Hawkins, 1975; Lagay, 1969-70; Mayer and Pratt, 1966-67; Smith, 1983). Most of the studies, however, deal with nonresponse among the general public. Little is known about the nonresponse in surveys of special subgroups in the population where any bias caused by nonresponse may have significant effects on the conclusions derived from the data.

A case in point is the increasing use of surveys in mass communication

research to determine journalists' job performance, their attitudes toward social and public policy issues, decision making in the process of news selection, and their relationships with other social and political institutions (e.g., Anderson, 1982; Anderson and Murdock, 1981; Drew and Wilhoit, 1976, Johnstone, 1976; Joseph, 1983; Olien, Tichenor, and Donohue, 1988, Pasternack, 1983; Ryan, 1979; Wilhoit and Drew, 1973). Such surveys of journalists have provided useful insights into the journalistic paradigms within and without the mass media organizations.

An understanding of the way journalists do their work and the extent to which their work shapes and is shaped by other social institutions undoubtedly requires an adequate and accurate survey of this special subgroup in the population. Any bias caused by nonresponse, particularly in mail surveys where nonresponse rate tends to be relatively higher, could have important theoretical implications. As a source of nonsampling error, nonresponse also represents a serious methodological issue that needs to be addressed in mass communication survey research.

Since the response rates in most mail surveys of journalists generally fall within the range of 30 to 65 percent,[1] nonresponse among journalists should be a major concern and interest to sociological and mass communication researchers. A search of literature in the area of journalism and mass communication research, however, yielded only one study that specifically looked at the potential impact of nonresponse in a survey of daily newspapers. More than a decade ago, in a mail survey of 317 general circulation daily newspapers, Cranberg (1975) examined the effects of follow-ups and telephone calls on the total response rate. He indicated that

"non-response error would be possible in any mail survey that seeks information that could reflect unfavorably on prospective respondents. Researchers who fail to guard against the possibility invite a biased result" (p. 543). Unfortunately, the study failed to further investigate effects of nonresponse bias on variable distributions.

A few other studies attempted to assess survey accuracy about the characteristics of respondents in terms of geographic distributions and newspaper circulations (e.g., Drew and Wilhoit, 1976; Hynds and Martin, 1979; Schiltz, Sigelman and Neal, 1973; Wilhoit and Drew, 1973). Although these studies indicated that their samples were fairly representative, it is not clear whether and to what extent nonresponse affects the distributions of other variables such as market and organizational characteristics of the mass media that may be of important research interest (see Lacy, 1987; Weaver and Wilhoit, 1986). As far as survey of journalists in mass communication research is concerned, this aspect of nonresponse deserves more attention and close examination.

As part of a larger project, this study attempts to determine nonresponse bias, if any, in a national survey of newspaper editors. Unlike the various approaches used in past studies to estimate nonresponse bias (for a review, see Hawkins, 1975), this study employs a multivariate method that may be useful in determining nonresponse: discriminant analysis. The multivariate statistical technique "allows the researcher to study the differences between two or more groups of objects with respect to several variables simultaneously" (Klecka, 1980, p. 7).

In this study, the focus is on the interpretation of group differences

between respondents and nonrespondents, rather than on the classification of newspaper editors into the groups.[2] Specifically, the following research questions were asked: What were the factors that would distinguish between the nonrespondents and the respondents? Which variables were the most powerful discriminators? And what were the reasons for nonresponse?

Method

In the study, a national sample proportionate to the circulation of 540 daily newspapers was selected from the 1987 Editor & Publisher International Yearbook. The sample represented 33 percent of the 1,657 newspapers listed in the yearbook. Since the majority of newspapers (85%) in the United States have a rather small circulation (less than 50,000), the sampling method was used to insure that papers with larger circulation would be included in the sample. In previous surveys of print journalists, circulation size is often used as a criterion in sample selection.

For various research purposes, inclusion of larger newspapers in the sample is not only desirable, but also important. Theoretically, larger newspapers usually cover domestic and foreign news more extensively, have a stronger impact on public policy, and tend to reach a wide range of readership, including the elites and influentials in society. Findings derived from the data collected thus would allow researchers to make inferences with regard to both the decision makers and the general public. On the other hand, since newspapers with larger circulation are often included in surveys of journalists, any bias caused by nonresponse would apparently have

differential effects on the distributions of variables related to the circulation. It is therefore crucial to examine nonresponse bias in surveys of newspapers, particularly when newspapers are used as the unit of sampling.

In the mail survey, a six-page closed-ended questionnaire, along with a cover letter and a business reply envelope, were mailed in mid-December, 1987 to the top editor (in most cases either managing editor or editor) of each newspaper selected in the sample. Approximately four weeks after the initial mailing, a second packet and a small gift (a pencil) were sent to those editors who had not responded. About a month later, those who did not respond to the second mailing were encouraged to return the questionnaire by an early March, 1988 deadline with a stamped return envelope. And finally, a week after the deadline, a postcard was sent to all the remaining editors, asking why they didn't return the questionnaires. Answers to the last mailing were used to help determine the causes for nonresponse.

The initial mailing drew 121 responses (22.4% of the total sample) and the second mailing produced another 114 responses, of which 109 (20.2%) completed the questionnaire. The third mailing generated 48 more usable questionnaires (8.9%). In total, the three mailings yielded a response rate of 51.6 percent. Given that editors tend to have tight time budgets and may have misgivings about academic research (e.g., Stempel, 1988), such a response rate was acceptable and, according to Babbie (1973), is adequate for analysis and reporting. Of course, randomness of nonresponse is far more important than a high response rate. A chi-square test of geographic locations (see Table 1) and newspaper circulations (not reported here) between respondents and nonrespondents shows that no systematic pattern

of nonresponse exists. In other words, there is some evidence suggesting the source of nonresponse errors appears to be random. On the two variables examined, editors from certain regions or from papers with certain circulations were not systematically over- or under-represented in the study.

Of the 262 nonrespondents (48.4%), 67 editors (12.4% of the total sample) offered a variety of reasons for not responding to the survey. In the discriminant analysis, the survey status of all the newspaper editors selected in the sample was the dependent variable. The classification of survey status was dichotomous--either it was a respondent or it was not. Those editors who returned, but declined to answer the questionnaire were classified as nonrespondents.

Like most special subgroups in the population, it is difficult, if not impossible, to find a single source like the census figures that would provide useful demographic information for all the newspaper editors in the United States. In past studies, comparisons between response and nonresponse on individual demographics and other characteristics such as personality differences are rare, simply because the data on nonresponse are extremely hard to come by. Since the newspapers were used as the sampling unit in the study, a number of internal and external variables related to the market and organizational characteristics of the newspapers were therefore employed to compare nonresponse with response.

Although such comparisons may be of some concern, there is support in the literature for this approach. First, previous studies have found that some of these variables could have an impact on newswork and the media

content (e.g., Johnstone, 1976; Lacy, 1987; Olien, Tichenor, and Donohue, 1988). For example, Olien, Tichenor, and Donohue (1988) indicated that corporate ownership influences editor perspectives and decisions. If journalistic practices are affected, among other things, by nonpersonal factors, it should be important and useful to determine if nonresponse bias has any differential effects on the distributions of these variables, especially when they are used as independent and control variables in the analysis.

Second, such use of aggregate measures is an accepted approach in estimation of nonresponse in sociological surveys of the general public (e.g., Hawkins, 1975; Lagay, 69-70). The aggregate measures used by social science researchers to estimate nonresponse bias are mostly based on existing census figures, including geographic and demographic data such as sex, race, age, family income, city types and regions, occupation, and type of neighborhood. By examining several different approaches to assess and adjust for nonresponse, however, Smith (1983, p. 83) concluded that "there is no simple, general, accurate way of measuring nonresponse bias."

The internal and external variables used in the study were as follows: circulation, publication time, ownership, number of news services to which the newspaper subscribe, size of editing staff including news executives, editors, and managers in the news department, percentage of city population with college education, percentage of workforce unemployed in the city, and median income per household in the city. These variables represent several different dimensions underlying some of the influencing factors that have been considered important in the study of how the mass media cover the news. To some extent, they can be used to define the psychosocial context in

which the newspaper editors perform their work and may provide clues to likely behaviors.

The intra media variables (circulation, publication time, ownership, number of news services and size of news editing staff) were based on the newspaper characteristics listed in the 1987 Editor & Publisher Yearbook. The extra media variables (percentage of city population with college education, percentage of workforce unemployed in the city, and median income per household in the city) came from City and County Data Book, 1983, 10th ed. Since the census data did not report on cities with a population of less than 25,000, 106 newspapers had missing values on this variable. In the discriminant analysis, these eight variables were used as predictors to separate the respondents and nonrespondents in the national survey of newspaper editors.

Results

In survey research, geographic location has often been used as one of many demographic variables to describe the psychosocial settings of the respondents. To determine if there was any bias caused by newspaper locations, Table 1 compares geographic regions among respondents, nonrespondents and the total sample. As is evident, questionnaires were returned by newspaper editors from all parts of the country. Among the five regions (East, South, Midwest, Southwest, and West), no significant distribution difference was found between respondents and nonrespondents ($X^2 = 3.70$, d.f. = 4, $p = .45$). Also the respondents in the three mailings did

not differ with regard to their geographic distributions (X^2 = 5.53, d.f. = 8, p = .70).

Compared to the total distribution of the 540 newspapers selected in the sample; with about 52 percent response rate, the geographic distribution of the respondents showed a striking similarity. Such similarity may be best demonstrated by the percentage error (Hawkins, 1975) caused by nonreponse. Using the total sample as the standard, the percentage error is a measure of the extent to which the sample after three mailings differs from the total sample. It is the ratio of the difference between the percent of sample distribution and the percent of the total sample distribution to the percent of the total sample distribution.

In comparison to the total sample, of the five regions, three regions appear to be somewhat under-represented in the sample (Midwest, -3.5%; South, -6.7%; and East, -5.4%) while two other regions were over-represented (Southwest, +12.0% and West, +12.6%). Although the nonresponse seems to cause distributional differences in terms of geographic location, the percentage errors for the five regions were relatively small. And there is no significant geographic bias caused by nonresponse. The result is in line with previous studies (e.g., Schiltz, Sigelman, and Neal, 1973).

The chi-square test shows that the two groups (respondents and nonrespondents) did not differ in terms of geographic distribution. How do they compare with regard to the eight market and organizational variables? The discriminant analysis attempts to answer the question. This technique is not only useful, but desirable. As mentioned earlier, the purpose of this study is to examine the differences between respondents and

nonrespondents with respect to several variables simultaneously.

A basic assumption of discriminant analysis requires that highly correlated variables cannot be used at the same time (Klecka, 1980). If multicollinearity exists among the independent variables, the standardized discriminant function coefficients sometimes can be unstable and thus misleading. Table 2 reports the pooled within-groups correlation matrix for the eight independent variables used in the discriminant analysis. Most of the coefficients are very small (r below .30) suggesting that interdependency is not a problem in the study. A few (r from .36 to .59) show some degree of moderate correlations, but the relationship is not a perfect one. The determinant of the correlation matrix for the eight independent variables is .24, indicating that there are no linear interrelations among the variables.

Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations for the two groups with regard to the eight independent variables. The overall pattern of the eight variables suggests that respondents tend to come from morning newspapers of noncorporate ownership and have more economic resources in wealthier communities. In the discriminant analysis, the stepwise method (Wilks' lambda) was used to select variables for entry into the analysis one at a time based on their discriminating power. Because there were only two groups (respondents and nonrespondents) involved, the analysis derived one discriminant function. The results are shown in Table 4. The chi-square test for the two group centroids (group means) are statistically significant (X^2 = 16.5, d.f. = 4, p = .002), indicating that respondents and nonrespondents do not have the same means on the discriminant function.

The stepwise discriminant analysis shows four variables contributing to the discriminant function: circulation, ownership, size of editing staff in the news department, and percentage of city population with college education. The first variable entered (circulation) was barely significant while the other three variables were highly significant in their discriminating power. The remaining four variables--publication time, number of wire services to which the newspaper subscribe, percentage of workforce unemployed in the city, and median household income in the city--failed to enter into the analysis, suggesting that they did not contribute much toward further discrimination between respondents and nonrespondents.

The standardized canonical discriminant function coefficients (beta weights) for the four variables that contribute most to the discrimination between the two groups are also given in Table 4. The beta weights represent the relative contribution of a variable to the discriminating power of the function. The actual signs of the beta weights are arbitrary (Norusis, 1985). When the sign is ignored, variables with relatively larger coefficients (discriminant weights) contribute more to the function than do variables with smaller weights. The results indicate that number of editing staff in the news department and circulation both made the greatest contribution to the discrimination function, followed by the percentage of city population with college education and type of ownership. Although ownership was not as important as the other three variables in its contribution, it was highly significant that more respondents came from newspapers of noncorporate ownership. This finding appears to lend some support to a contention by

decision making.

What can we conclude from the above analysis? If results of the discriminant analysis are any indication, the overall pattern of the variables suggests that market and organizational structures may have an impact on how newspaper editors respond to the demand of mail survey research. It appears that editors from smaller, noncorporate-owned newspapers with larger editing staff were more likely to respond to survey research than editors from larger, chain newspapers with smaller editing staff (see the individual group means in Table 3). In other words, the organizational structure of the newspapers, especially the size of editing staff in the newsroom, seems to influence the way editors react to sociological surveys that apparently require them to take time off their busy daily schedule. For newspapers with smaller circulations, but larger editing staff in the newsroom, it would mean less work and more time for the editors involved. Since there are fewer readers to serve and smaller areas to cover, there is also less news to be processed in the newsroom. This may give editors some extral time to deal with time consuming task such as lengthy mail questionnaires. For larger newspapers with smaller editing staff, the opposite would be true. The nonrespondents' answers to the fourth mailing concerning why they didn't return the questionnaire offer some support to this observation.

Why didn't the editors respond to sociological surveys? The incentives for the editors to respond or not to respond usually depend on three factors: (1) the nature of the survey itself (e.g., the subject content), (2) individual concerns (e.g., distrust in survey research), and (3) the context in

which the editors find themselves at the time the survey comes to their attention (e.g., time constraint in the newsroom).

Although it was difficult to determine whether responses to the last mailing were representative of the nonrespondents, a check of geographic locations of those who returned the postcards again showed no systematic pattern of bias. It should be noted, however, that examination of nonresponse reasons is mostly exploratory, subject to more vigorous probe. Based on multiple answers from 67 editors (25.6% of the 262 nonrespondents), the most often cited reasons in the closed-ended question were apparently time-related. Many editors indicated they couldn't take time to answer the questionnaire (37.9%) or the survey was too long (24.2%) or they received too many surveys per week (19.7%). Other reasons given by the editors were as follows: don't like filling out surveys (15.2%); have misgivings about academic research (10.6%); the addressee was no longer here (9.1%); the questions were confusing (6.1%); newspaper has a policy against participating in survey research (6.1%); the subject was not important (3.0%); don't know much about the subject (1.5%); concerned about confidentiality (4.5%); didn't receive the questionnaire (6.1%); and miscellaneous reasons (18.2%).

It is evident that the reasons for nonresponse involve more with time constraint on the editors' work than with individual differences such as attitudes toward and perceptions of sociological survey research per se. Only a small number of nonrespondents cited reasons that clearly suggested editors' individual distrust in survey research. And much fewer editors indicated that the subject presented in the questionnaire was the reason for

not responding, suggesting that the survey subject (editors' perceptions of foreign news) did not necessarily cause nonresponse. In this study, access failure was not a problem since none of the questionnaires was returned by the post office and nearly all questionnaires appeared to have reached the target editors.

Conclusion and Discussion

This study uses discriminant analysis to determine nonresponse in a survey of a specialized subgroup in the population--newspaper editors. Based on 52 percent response rate after three mailings, the study examines the differences between respondents and nonrespondents on a number of intra- and extra-media variables obtained from published sources. The assumption is that these variables can be used to define psychosocial context in which newspaper editors do their work and may provide clues to likely behaviors. For one thing, editor's participation in non-media related work such as survey research requires a shifting of his or her time and effort from the editorial work. Editorial work, of course, is closely tied to the organizational structure of the newspapers in general and the tight time constraint in the newsroom in particular.

The results suggest that nonresponse in this national survey of 540 daily newspaper editors did not cause significant bias in terms of geographic distribution, circulation, and some other community-related characteristics. The only difference caused by nonresponse appears to be related to the structure of the newsroom, particularly with the size of editing staff. Such

response bias, however, was largely negligible and could be corrected or further reduced if the nonrespondents were given time to respond to the survey.

According to the reasons offered by the nonrespondents, it seems newspaper editors are bombarded with various sociological surveys every week. Consider, for example, the following comments provided by several editors: "We've been getting surveys by the truck load lately;" "I had, literally, 14 surveys, yours included, piled on my desk and just said 'the hell with it' and threw them all away;" "How many of you guys are out there?" "There are too many to deal with;" "Far too many tendentious questionnaires in my mail;" and "There are at least two per week. I can't do them all." Given that the news business is time-bound, it is understandable why newspaper editors would resist survey research, particularly mail surveys. Survey questionnaires take time and effort to answer and editors usually have rather tight time budgets in the newsroom.

Since market and organizational variables may have certain impacts on how editors perform their work and subsequently on the news content, the similarity between respondents and nonrespondents concerning the variables under study has interesting and useful implications, both theoretical and methodological, for sociological and mass communication research. Theoretically, it would mean that the psychosocial environment that is likely to affect behaviors is not necessarily biased as a result of nonresponse. Methodologically, it means that mail surveys with a response rate of at least 50 % might prove to be sufficient to obtain unbiased information for analysis. The results are important to mass communication

and sociological researchers preparing to do a survey of journalists. They should increase confidence in the broader generalization of the findings, especially when these factors are used as independent and control variables with respect to the influences on the news content.

Although it would be useful and more informative to study the effects of editors' idioscyncracies on nonresponse, it is obvious that attitude variables and many other idiosyncratic factors have no one value that can be verified by the census figures or other independent sources for information. Estimation of nonresponse with regard to individual differences will have to rely on interviewing nonrespondents either by phone or by personal contact. But, then, the extraordinary efforts and the extra cost for the subsequent interview of a representative sample of the nonrespondents tend to nullify one important advantage in mail surveys: inexpensive collection of a large amount of information. This is more apparent when survey researchers attempt to reach professional journalists who, according to many previous studies, may not be easily persuaded to participate in sociological surveys.

In this study, the total cost for each newspaper editor was just a little more than one dollar. And, with about 52 percent response rate, the results do not necessarily show any severe, significant bias caused by nonresponse. What this means is that a well-designed and carefully executed mail survey is still the best and less expensive alternative in surveys of American journalists, especially when research budget is tight.

Notes

1. This was the reported range of response rate for most of the mail survey studies published in the Journalism Quarterly from 1950 through 1988.

2. Since all the cases were used in computing the discriminant function, we did not perform the classification analysis. According to Hair et al. (1979), if the same cases are used in doing both, the results may be biased.

References

American Statistical Association (1974). Report on the ASA conference on surveys of human populations. The American Statistician, 28, 30-34.

Anderson, D. A. (1982). How newspaper editors reacted to Post s Pulitzer prize hoax. Journalism Quarterly, 59, 363-366.

Anderson, D. A. and Murdock, M. (1981). Effects of communication law decisions on daily newspaper editors. Journalism Quarterly, 58, 525-528, 534.

Babbie, E. R. (1989). The pratice of social research, fifth edition. Belmont. California: Wadsworth Publishing Company, Inc.

Blumberg, H. H., Fuller, C., and Hare, A. P. (1974). Response rates in postal surveys. Public Opinion Quarterly, 38, 113-123.

Cranberg, G. (1975). Mail survey respondents and non-respondents. Journalism Quarterly, 52, 542-543.

Drew, D. and Wilhoit, G. C. (1976). Newshole allocation policies of American daily newspapers. Journalism Quarterly, 53, 434-440, 482.

Hair, J. F., et al. (1979). Multivariate data analysis. Tulsa: Petroleum Publishing.

Hawkins, D. F. (1975). Estimation of nonresponse bias. Sociological Methods & Research, 3, 461-488.

Hynds, E. C. and Martin, C. H. (1979). How non-daily editors describe status and function of editorial pages. Journalism Quarterly, 56, 318-323.

Johnstone, J. W. C. (1976). Organizational constraints on newswork. Journalism Quarterly, 53, 5-13.

Joseph, T. (1983). Television reporters' and managers' preferences on decision-making. Journalism Quarterly, 60, 476-479.

Klecka, W. R. (1980). Discriminant analysis. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kochersberser, R. C., Jr. (1987). Post-card questionnaire may boost response rate. Journalism Quarterly, 64, 861-863.

Lacy, S. (1987). The effects of intracity competition on daily newspaper content. Journalism Quarterly, 64, 281-290.

Lagay, B. W. (1969-70). Assessing bias: A comparison of two methods. Public Opinion Quarterly, 33, 615-618

Mayer, C. S. and Pratt, R. W., Jr. (1966-67). A note on nonresponse in a mail survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 30, 637-646.

Norusis, M. J. (1985). SPSS X. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Olien, C. N., Tichenor, P. J., and Donohue, G. A. (1988). Relation between corporate ownership and editor attitudes about business. Journalism Quarterly, 65, 259-266.

Pasternack, S. (1983). Editors and the risk of libel in letters. Journalism Quarterly, 60, 311-328.

Ryan, M. (1979). Attitude of scientists and journalists toward media coverage of science news. Journalism Quarterly, 56, 18-26, 53.

Schiltz, T., Sigelman, L., and Neal, R. (1973). Perspective of managing editors on coverage of foreign policy news. Journalism Quarterly, 50, 716-721.

Schwirian, K. P. and Blaine, H. R. (1966-67). Questionnaire return in the study of blue collar workers. Public Opinion Quarterly, 30, 656-663.

Smith, T. W. (1983). The hidden 25 percent: An analysis of nonresponse on the 1980 general social survey. Public Opinion Quarterly, 47, 386-404.

Sosdian, C. P. and Sharp, L. M. (1980). Nonresponse in mail surveys: Access failure or respondent resistance. Public Opinion Quarterly, 44, 396-

402.

Stempel, G. H. III (1988). The Chi-squares strike back: JQ's editor replies. The Quill, January 1988, pp. 30-31.

Traugott, M. W., Groves, R. M., and Lepkowski, J. M. (1987). Using dual frame designs to reduce nonresponse in telephone surveys. Public Opinion Quarterly, 51, 522-539.

Weaver, D. H. and Wilhoit, G. C. (1986). The American journalists. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Wilhoit, G. C. and Drew, D. G. (1973). The politics, community participation and profile of the editorial writer. Journalism Quarterly, 50, 638-644.

Table 1. Comparison of Geographic Regions among Respondents, Nonrespondents and Total Sample

Regions[a]	Respondents[b]				Non-respondents	Total Sample
	First[c]	Second	Third	Total		
East	22.3%	20.2%	20.8%	21.2%	23.7%	22.4%
South	18.2	22.0	25.0	20.9	24.0	22.4
Midwest	26.4	23.9	20.8	24.5	26.3	25.4
Southwest	11.6	13.8	4.2	11.2	8.8	10.0
West	21.5	20.2	29.2	22.3	17.2	19.8
Total	121	109	48	278	262	540
Percent of total sample	22.4	20.2	8.9	51.5	48.5	

[a] States were divided into five regions: East (Connecticut, Delaware, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, Vermont, and D.C.); South (Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina, Tennessee, Virginia, and West Virginia); Midwest (Illinois, Indiana, Iowa, Kansas, Michigan, Minnesota, Missouri, Nebraska, Ohio, and Wisconsin); Southwest (Arkansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas); and West (Alaska, Arizona, California, Colorado, Hawaii, Idaho, Montana, Nevada, North Dakota, Oregon, South Dakota, Utah, Washington, and Wyoming).

[b] Chi-square test between respondents and nonrespondents: $X^2 = 3.70$, d.f. = 4, $p = .45$.

[c] Chi-square test for the three different mailings: $X^2 = 5.53$, d.f. = 8, $p = .70$.

Table 2: Pooled With-Groups Correlations Matrix

		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1	Circulation	-							
2	Number of news services	.36	-						
3	Percentage of city population with college education	-.02	.00	-					
4	Percentage of workforce unemployed in city	.04	-.05	-.50	-				
5	Median household income in the city	-.12	-.15	.30	-.15	-			
6	Number of news editing staff	59	.59	-.07	-.00	-.16	-		
7	Publication time	.27	.11	.03	-.12	-.16	.23	-	
8	Ownership	-.03	-.09	.03	.10	.01	-.01	-.06	-

Table 3: Groups Means and Standard Deviations (in parentheses)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Respondents	126076	3.7	18.7	10.0	15351	27.1	0.65	0.67
	(137553)	(1.9)	(7.7)	(3.9)	(3026)	(15.8)	(0.48)	(0.47)
Non-respondents	171712	3.6	17.3	10.4	15340	24.1	0.63	0.72
	(282854)	(2.0)	(7.4)	(4.2)	(3091)	(15.2)	(0.48)	(0.45)

Note: In the column headings, 1 represents circulation; 2, number of news services; 3, percentage of city population with college education; 4, percentage of workforce unemployed in the city; 5, median household income in the city; 6, number of news editing staff; 7, publication time (morning paper = 1); 8, ownership (chain ownership = 1)

Table 4: Standardized Canonical Discriminant Function Coefficients

Variables	Beta weights	Partial F	d.f.	p
Number of news editing staff	1.00	6.54	259	.002
Circulation	-1.00	2.94	260	.088
Percentage of city population with college education	0.42	5.30	258	.002
Ownership	-0.26	4.24	257	.002

Note: Group centroids: respondents, .23, nonrespondents, -.29; eigenvalue = .07; canonical correlation = .25; Wilks' lambda = .94; chi-square = 16.5, d.f. = 4, $p < .01$.